

REMARKS

Claims 25-35 and 45-49 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 25-35 are allowed. Claims 45-49 are rejected. Claims 45-48 have been canceled, while claim 49 has been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 49 can be found in paragraphs [0005], and [0047]. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

Rejection of Claim 49 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Myerson, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0170999 A1 (“Myerson”).

The Office Action argues Myerson teaches a self-assembled monolayer (SAM) with local domain area sizes ranging from $25\ \mu\text{m}^2$ to $2500\mu\text{m}^2$, and illustrates this SAM can be comprised of rigid biphenyl thiols. Since this range of domain sizes encompasses a SAM with domain area sizes exceeding $10^5\ \text{nm}^2$, the Office Action argues Myerson teaches the present invention of claim 49.

As amended, claim 49 recites a SAM which exists in two forms — one less structurally stable form which becomes a more structurally stable form after heat treatment. Applicants respectively submit that amended claim 49 is patentable over Myerson because Myerson fails to teach or disclose all the elements recited in amended claim 49.

Myerson teaches that when a patterned elastomeric stamp is inked with alkaneethiols and applied to the surface of a substrate, SAMs are created where the stamp and the surface meet. See Paragraph [0048]. Myerson teaches these SAMs may be comprised of rigid diphenyl thiols. Additionally, Myerson teaches these SAMs have domain area sizes from $25\ \mu\text{m}^2$ to $2500\mu\text{m}^2$, however, Myerson does not teach or disclose that these SAMs exhibit two different forms – one less structurally stable which becomes more structurally stable after heat treatment.

Since Myerson does not teach or disclose SAMs exhibiting two different forms, Myerson does not anticipate claim 49, as anticipation requires each and every element set forth in the claim to be found in a single prior art reference. In view of the present amendment, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 49 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 27 May 2011

/Richard A. Sutkus/

Richard A. Sutkus
Registration No. 43,941

CUSTOMER No.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072